

Rachel Steinback, SBN 310700  
LAW OFFICE OF RACHEL STEINBACK  
P.O. Box 291253  
Los Angeles, CA 90029  
(t) 213-537-5370  
(f) 213-232-4003  
(e) [steinbacklaw@gmail.com](mailto:steinbacklaw@gmail.com)

Carol A. Sobel, SBN 84483  
Monique A. Alarcon, SBN 311650  
Avneet S. Chattha, SBN 316545  
LAW OFFICE OF CAROL SOBEL  
725 Arizona Avenue, Suite 300  
Santa Monica, CA 90401  
(t) 310-393-3055  
(e) carolsobel@aol.com  
(e) monique.alarcon8@gmail.com  
(e) avneet.chattha7@gmail.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
(Additional Counsel on Following Page)*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

Rivera Martinez, et al.,

Case No. 5:18-cv-01125-R-GJS  
Assigned to: Hon. Manuel L. Real

**Plaintiffs,**

V.

The Geo Group, Inc., et al.

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN  
SUPPORT OF NOTICE OF  
RELATED CASE [Doc. #10]**

### Defendants.

1 Catherine Sweetser, SBN 271142  
2 SCHONBRUN SEPLOW HARRIS & HOFFMAN LLP  
3 11543 W. Olympic Boulevard  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90064  
(t) 310-396-0731  
(f) 310-399-7040  
(e) csweetser@sshhlaw.com

6 Colleen Flynn, SBN 234281  
7 LAW OFFICE OF COLLEEN FLYNN  
8 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2910  
9 Los Angeles, CA 90010  
(t) 213-252-9444  
(f) 213-252-0091  
(e) cflynnlaw@yahoo.com

12 Matthew Strugar, SBN 232951  
13 LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW STRUGAR  
14 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2910  
15 Los Angeles, CA 90010  
(t) 323-696-2299  
(e) matthewstrugar@gmail.com

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Defendants GEO Group and Duran argue that the cases should not be related  
2 because they do not state identical legal claims -- an observation Plaintiffs do not  
3 dispute. But that is not the inquiry the Court must make in determining how to act  
4 on Plaintiffs' Notice.

5 As Plaintiffs state in their Notice [Doc. #10], the factual issues we will be  
6 litigating in this action will intersect considerably, particularly in the discovery  
7 phase, with the factual issues the *Novoa* action will be litigating. In *Novoa*, the  
8 plaintiffs are arguing that GEO Group violated the law in a myriad of ways, and  
9 that it did so by preying on the detainee-plaintiffs at Adelanto (from 2011 to the  
10 present) by subjecting them to appallingly sub-standard living conditions, denying  
11 them adequate food and drinking water, restricting their access to counsel and their  
12 families, degrading them and verbally abusing them, retaliating against them by  
13 improperly placing them in segregation, and denying them adequate medical care.  
14 The violations Plaintiffs allege in this action occurred against that precise  
15 backdrop: those are literally the allegations the instant Plaintiffs were attempting to  
16 bring to the attention of ICE officials on the day they were attacked by the GEO  
17 Group guards.

18 As this Court may have seen, Defendant GEO Group categorically denied  
19 each of Plaintiffs' allegations in its Answer [Doc. #8]. There is no doubt, then,  
20 that the discovery into each of these issues will be substantial -- just as it will be in  
21 *Novoa*. And, as the undersigned counsel know from their decades of experience  
22 litigating these types of cases, that process is likely to require court involvement on  
23 issues such as scope, privilege, protective orders and the like -- just as it will in  
24 *Novoa*. The two cases will, then, involve substantially related and similar  
25 questions of law and fact that could, if litigated before two different courts, result  
26 in inconsistent rulings. The litigation of the two cases in two separate fora will  
27 also result in substantive duplication of labor by the two courts.

28 //

If Defendants' characterization of the two cases was correct, then the Court would be correct in refusing to relate the cases. But it is not. To conserve judicial economy, and to ensure consistency in the rulings that will significantly impact the trajectory of both actions, this case should be related to the *Novoa* action.

Dated: June 20, 2018      Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICE OF RACHEL STEINBACK  
LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL  
SCHONBRUN SEPLOW HARRIS & HOFFMAN LLP  
LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW STRUGAR  
LAW OFFICE OF COLLEEN FLYNN

By: /s/ Rachel Steinback  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs